

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments, and the following remarks.

This will make of record a Telephone Interview on or about September 17, 2008, between the Patent Examiner and the undersigned attorney during which the Final Office Action dated August 28, 2008 was discussed. The discussion was directed to which claims were allowed. Hence, the Supplemental Final Office Action dated September 22, 2008, was mailed.

The amendments to this patent application are as follows.

On Page 7 of this Office Action, the Patent Examiner stated that claims 84, 96, 99, 122, 123, and 127 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. For these reasons, dependent claims 84, 96, 99, 122, 123, and 127 have been rewritten as independent claims.

Claims 102 to 119 and 131 have been allowed.

Finally, rejected claims 48 to 75, 77, 80, 85 to 94, 97, 120, 130 and 132 to 133 have been cancelled.

Claim 76 has been amended to now depend on allowed claim 84, rather than on cancelled claim 75.

Claim 78 has been amended to now depend on allowed claim 84, rather than on cancelled claim 75.

Claim 79 has been amended to now depend on allowed claim 84, rather than on cancelled claim 75.

Claim 81 has been amended to now depend on allowed claim 84, rather than on cancelled claim 80.

Claim 82 has been amended to now depend on allowed claim 84, rather than on cancelled claim 80.

Claim 83 has been amended to now depend on allowed claim 84, rather than on cancelled claim 80. Also, claim 83 now recites "a" third transmission path so as to provide antecedent basis.

Claim 95 has been amended to now depend on allowed claim 96, rather than on cancelled claim 133.

Claim 98 has been amended to now depend on allowed claim 99, rather than on cancelled claim 97.

Claim 100 has been amended to now depend on allowed claim 99, rather than on cancelled claim 97.

Claim 101 has been amended to now depend on allowed claim 99, rather than on cancelled claim 97.

Claim 121 has been amended to now depend on allowed claim 122, rather than on cancelled claim 120.

Claim 124 has been amended to now depend on allowed claim 122, rather than on cancelled claim 120.

Claim 125 has been amended to now depend on allowed claim 122, rather than on cancelled claim 120.

Claim 126 has been amended to now depend on allowed claim 122, rather than on cancelled claim 120.

Claim 128 has been amended to now depend on allowed claim 127, rather than on cancelled claim 120.

Claim 129 has been amended to now depend on allowed claim 127, rather than on cancelled claim 120.

On Page 2 of the Office Action, the Patent Examiner has rejected claim 83 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In response to this rejection, claim 83 has been amended to insert "a" so as to provide an antecedent basis for claim 83.

Also on Page 2 of the Office Action, the Patent Examiner has rejected claims 95 and 98 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In response to this rejection, the term "main differential" is known and is understood by those skilled in the art.

Withdrawal of this ground of rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, is respectfully requested.

On Page 3 of the Office Action, the Patent Examiner has rejected claims 48 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Rohs '131*.

Also on Page 3 of the Office Action, the Patent Examiner has rejected claims 75-80 and 82 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *DeVincent* '667.

On Page 4 of the Office Action, the Patent Examiner has rejected claims 120, 121, 124-126, 128, and 129 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Winter et al* '581.

Also on Page 4 of the Office Action, the Patent Examiner has rejected claims 97, 98, 100, 132, and 133 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Wedeniowski* '820.

On Page 5 of the Office Action, the Patent Examiner has rejected claims 60-63 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Rohs* '131 in view of *Flichy* '107.

On Page 5 of the Office Action, the Patent Examiner has rejected claims 65, 66, and 68-72 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Rohs* '131 in view of *Flichy* '107 and further in view of *Schmidt* '661.

Also on Page 5 of the Office Action, the Patent Examiner has rejected claim 81 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *DeVincent* '667.

On Page 5 of the Office Action, the Patent Examiner has rejected claim 101 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wedeniowski 820*.

On Page 6 of the Office Action, the Patent Examiner has rejected claim 130 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Schmidt '661*.

Because all the claims indicated as being allowable namely, claims 84, 96, 99, 122, 123, and 127 have been rewritten in independent claim format, these claims are presumed to now be allowed.

On Page 6 of the Office Action, the Patent Examiner has stated that claims 102 to 119 and 131 are allowed.

With respect to the prior art rejections mentioned above, all of the prior art rejected claims have now either been cancelled, or have been amended to now depend from allowable claims 84, 96, 99, 122, 123, and 127. Withdrawal of these grounds of rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 35 U.S.C. 103 is respectfully requested.

Because a total of (11) eleven independent claims were paid for when this patent application was originally filed, it is



believed that no fee is required for the filing of this Amendment, since there are now a total of eight (8) independent claims. However, if any fee is required, the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks is hereby authorized to charge any additionally required fee, or to credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 03-2468.

A prompt notification of allowability is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Ulrich ROHS ET AL.

COLLARD & ROE, P.C.
1077 Northern Boulevard
Roslyn, New York 11576
(516) 365-9802

Frederick J. Dorchak, Reg. No. 29,298.
Edward R. Freedman, Reg. No. 26,048
Attorneys for Applicants

ERF:lgh

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on December 17, 2008.

Amy Klein

R:\Patents\R\ROHS, U. ET AL - 19 PCT\amendment final oa december 2008.wpd